

5 74 85

BULLETIN
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

1915: No. 30

MAY 25

1915

**A Constitutional Tax for the Support
of Higher Educational Institutions
in Texas**

Bibliography and Selected Arguments

Edited by
E. D. SHURTER
Chairman of the University Interscholastic League



Published by the University six times a month and entered as
second-class matter at the postoffice at
AUSTIN, TEXAS.

DEPARTMENT OF EXTENSION.

The Department of Extension of the University of Texas was established for the purpose of rendering service to the people of the State generally, and especially to those who are unable to attend the University. The work of this department is carried on under the following five divisions:

Public Discussion Division.

This division has immediate charge of "The University Interscholastic League." This is an organization of the schools of Texas for the purpose of promoting contests in debate, declamation, spelling, essay-writing, and athletics. The university is desirous of aiding the schools in the matter of training their students for citizenship; and also to aid teachers in developing, controlling, and standardizing athletic activities in the schools. Every school in Texas, no matter how small, should become a member of this organization.

This division is also engaged in the preparation of reference lists and material on various subjects of general interest, and the collection of "package" libraries for loaning to citizens of Texas upon application. Books and pamphlets thus loaned may be kept not longer than two weeks. The person to whom material is loaned pays the postage both ways. University bulletins need not be returned unless specially requested. Loan libraries are now ready on the following subjects: Agriculture; Airships; Alcohol; Arbitration; Athletics; Banks and Banking; Birds; Boy Problem; Boy Scouts; Canning Clubs; Capital Punishment; Child Labor; Child Study; Child Welfare; Christmas; Cigarette Habit; Civil Service; Co-education; Commission Government; Compulsory Education; Conservation of Resources; Contagion and Contagious Diseases; Convict Labor; Co-operative Marketing; Corn; Cost of Living; Cotton; Crime and Criminals; Disarmament; Domestic Science; Drama; European War; Flies; Games; Germany; Government Ownership of Public Utilities; Hogs; Hours of Labor; Immigration; Income Tax; Indians; Industrial Education; Initiative and Referendum; Irrigation; Journalism; Juvenile Courts; Kindergarten; Labor Unions; Land Tenantry; Manual Training; Merchant Marine; Mexico; Military Education; Milk; Minimum Wage; Monopolies; Monroe Doctrine; Montessori Teaching; Mothers Clubs; Moving Pictures; Municipal Improvement; Municipal Ownership; Nature Study; Negro; Nutrition; Old Age Pensions; Open and Closed Shop; Panama Canal; Panama-Pacific Exposition; Parcel Post; Peace; Pecan Culture; Philippines; Playgrounds; Poultry; residential Term; Prison Reform; Prohibition; Public Health; Railroads; Recall; Recitations and Readings; Red Cross; Religious Education; Roads; Rural Credit; Rural Life; Rural Schools; Russia; Sanitation; School Gardens; Schoolhouses; School Hygiene; School Libraries; School Lunches; Sewage; Short Story; Single Tax; Socialism; South America; Story Telling; Submarine Warfare; Suffrage; Educational Qualification; Tariff; United States Army; United States Navy; Woman Labor; Woman Suffrage; Women's Clubs.

Clippings and miscellaneous material have also been collected on various other subjects. Correspondence is invited. Address Extension Librarian, University, Austin.

Public Lecture Division.

Provision has been made to allow members of the staff of instruc-

(Continued on inside back cover)

BULLETIN
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

1915: No. 30

MAY 25

1915

**A Constitutional Tax for the Support
of Higher Educational Institutions
in Texas**

Bibliography and Selected Arguments

Edited by
E. D. SHURTER
Chairman of the University Interscholastic League



Published by the University six times a month and entered as
second-class matter at the postoffice at
AUSTIN, TEXAS.

LB 2826
T455

The benefits of education and of useful knowledge, generally diffused through a community, are essential to the preservation of a free government.

Sam. Houston.

Cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. . . . It is the only dictator that freemen acknowledge and the only security that freemen desire.

President Mirabeau B. Lamar.

It is only out of the contest of facts and brains that the right can ever be evolved—only on the anvil of discussion can the spark of truth be struck out.

Joseph H. Choate.

D. of D.
JUL 1 1918

INTRODUCTION

The subject for debate in the University Interscholastic League for 1915-19 is: *Resolved, That a constitutional tax of one mill, equitably apportioned, should be levied for the support of the state institutions of higher education in Texas, and that supplementary appropriations by the Legislature should be prohibited.* By a "mill tax" is meant a tax of one mill on every dollar of assessed property in the State, or ten cents on every one hundred dollars. By "constitutional tax" is meant an amendment to the State constitution fixing such a tax, as opposed to a statutory tax which might be adopted by legislative enactment. The term "state institutions of higher education" includes the University of Texas, the Agricultural and Mechanical College, the College of Industrial Arts, the four State normals for white teachers, and the Prairie View Normal for Negroes.

Under the present system of support, the boards of directors of the different schools submit estimates of the needs of their institutions to the Legislature at its regular biennial session, and the latter makes appropriations therefor covering the two years next succeeding. In addition to the biennial appropriation, the University receives about \$160,000 each year from its permanent endowment fund established through grants of land by the founders of the State. The Agricultural and Mechanical College receives from the United States Government annually about \$60,000, and from the State government several thousand dollars from the operation of the Pure Feed Control Law.

Twenty-three states have a fixed tax for the support of their institutions of higher education. Some of these states provide for the tax in their state constitutions, while in others the tax is by legislative enactment. In practically all states having a special tax, the revenue derived therefrom is supplemented by special appropriations by the Legislature. The tax varies from a small fraction of a mill in some states to a mill in Illinois. In some states the tax is applied to the support of only the State University, while in others it applies to all of the higher schools, including the State normals. In most states the Legislature

appropriates from the general revenue a sum which is considered necessary for the needs of the higher institutions. A few, including Texas, California and Michigan, have a permanent land endowment which supplements the annual income.

Dissatisfaction with the existing status of financial support for our State institutions of higher education has long been felt by leading educators and statesmen. This has been due in part to the inadequacy of the legislative appropriations, and in part to the feeling that this method of support is harmful in other ways which could be remedied by a change in method. Some have proposed a constitutional amendment fixing a definite tax for the special schools; some have favored instead a legislative measure establishing the tax or, as still others have proposed, setting aside a certain per cent. of the total State revenue for the higher State schools; while yet another remedy advanced has been the idea of a permanent fund created by the issuance of bonds.

THE ISSUES INVOLVED

It should be borne in mind that the question to be debated is not a question of liberal or meager support for the schools under consideration, but simply a question of the best method of providing the necessary support. The affirmative will assume, and the negative will readily admit, that Texas is below even the average of states of equal population and wealth, in the matter of financial support given her State schools. The issues involved, therefore, are: (1) Will the proposed plan provide more liberal support than the present method? (2) Are there other evils connected with the present method which the proposed plan would remedy? (3) Is the proposed plan better than any other that could be advanced?

THE CASE FOR THE AFFIRMATIVE

In proposing a constitutional tax of one mill for the support of our State institutions of higher learning, the affirmative maintains:

(1) That under the existing plan of biennial appropriations (a) All of the State's higher schools are suffering from lack of sufficient funds to meet their growing needs, (b) The governing boards cannot formulate definite policies for their respective

schools covering a number of years, (e) The schools are subjected to undue political influence which is harmful, (d) Jealousies and hurtful rivalries among the different institutions result from the biennial scramble for appropriations.

(2) That a constitutional tax of one mill will (a) render adequate financial aid, (b) provide an automatic means of definite and increasing support to meet the increasing demands of the schools from year to year, (c) remove the schools from politics, (d) place them upon a dignified basis of independence that will remove existing causes of hurtful rivalry.

(3) The affirmative further maintains that a tax of one mill, the revenue therefrom growing with the growth of the State, will be adequate for the support of our institutions of higher learning; that it should be a constitutional provision, and not be subject to change or repeal through legislative action; that by the exercise of due foresight unforeseen contingencies or losses in the administration of the school's funds can be provided against; and that the prohibition of supplementary legislative appropriations will conduce to a more business-like management of the schools and to the elimination of the politics and harmful rivalries that result from dependence, whether in whole or in part, upon legislative appropriations.

The foregoing outlined arguments for the affirmative are not further elaborated here because most of the evidence presented in subsequent pages of this bulletin bear upon the affirmative side, in one way or another. In fact, there is very little printed matter supporting directly the negative side. For that reason the following outlined argument for the negative is somewhat fuller than that given for the affirmative. But it should be understood that the editor has not attempted fully to outline either side; that the outlines are intended to be suggestive only; and that students are expected to organize and develop the arguments for themselves.

THE CASE FOR THE NEGATIVE

The negative will readily admit the need of more liberal financial support for the State's higher educational institutions. It may also be admitted that, under existing conditions, these schools are sometimes subjected to unnecessary and hurtful rival-

ries and political influences. However, among other and better plans for meeting the situation than that proposed by the affirmative are:

(1) Remove by constitutional amendment the present prohibition upon the Legislature from levying taxes or making appropriations for the erection of buildings for the State University, and enact a statutory law levying a special tax for the support of all the schools for higher education.

(2) Adopt a constitutional tax of two-thirds of a mill, say, and leave the Legislature free to make supplementary appropriations.

(3) Issue bonds for the creation of a permanent fund for the different institutions, such fund to be supplemented by biennial legislative appropriations.

In weighing the advantages of any one or all of these measures over the one advanced by the affirmative, let us consider the objections to the affirmative proposition. First and fundamentally, it is too rigid. It does not admit of a possible contingency when the schools would have need of additional assistance which they could not obtain on account of the prohibition of appropriations by the Legislature. Such a contingency might be due to a fire, a shrinking in taxable value on account of crop failures, financial panic or other cause, or an unlooked-for increase in attendance at the different schools. It has been found expedient to increase the tax rate for general revenues from time to time; then why might it not be necessary to do the same for the tax rate for higher education?

The experience of other states does not argue either the necessity for or the advisability of so rigid a measure. This rigidity could not be easily removed by constitutional amendment, for experience shows that, no matter how obviously desirable a constitutional change may be, it is next to impossible to get the people to adopt it, especially if it would make possible an increase in the expenses of government.

This absolute removal of the schools from financial dependence upon the Legislature is also undemocratic, and might easily lead to the growth of aristocratic or ultra-conservative tendencies in the schools. While it is admitted that they should not be entirely dependent upon any particular legislature for sup-

port, yet to remove them altogether from any dependence upon the body which represents the people, would be equally bad. A middle ground is the best, such as would obtain as to either of the plans proposed by the negative.

The plan of issuing bonds for the creation of a permanent fund for the different institutions, such fund to be supplemented by the biennial appropriations, might be advanced as an alternative measure. This plan has from time to time received the attention and support of educators and members of the Legislature and of the governing boards of the different institutions. A strong point in favor of bond issues is that this would distribute the cost of education more equitably, since a larger share of such cost would fall upon succeeding generations who will reap the benefits of educating the present generation. If cities and counties may issue bonds for school purposes, why not the Legislature, representing the whole State, issue bonds for the support of the special State schools? Is not one as democratic, as just, and as desirable as the other? The chief point against such a proposition is the people's inherent prejudice against the issuance of bonds. But the people are also strongly opposed to any increase in the tax rate, and the constitutional amendment proposed by the affirmative would probably be as difficult to pass as would an amendment authorizing and instructing the Legislature to issue bonds for the creation of a permanent fund for the purpose under consideration. •

Either of the plans suggested by the negative would render adequate financial aid without leading to extravagance; would be sufficiently automatic and definite to enable the school authorities to pursue consistent plans through a period of years; would remove the schools from politics so far as that is desirable; would lessen materially the strife and jealousies among the different institutions caused by the biennial scramble for appropriations; and would not be attended by the evils which must be expected from the rigid and undemocratic plan of the affirmative.

TEXAS TAX RATE AND TAX VALUATION FROM 1904 TO 1911

(Taken From the Texas Almanac for 1914.)

| Year | Advalorum tax | School tax | Valuation |
|------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| 1904 | 16 $\frac{2}{3}$ cents | 18 cents | \$1,082,779,775 |
| 1905 | 16 $\frac{2}{3}$ cents | 18 cents | 1,139,022,730 |
| 1906 | 20 cents | 18 cents | 1,221,159,869 |
| 1907 | 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents | 20 cents | 1,635,297,115 |
| 1908 | 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents | 12 $\frac{2}{3}$ cents | 2,174,122,480 |
| 1909 | 5 cents | 16 $\frac{2}{3}$ cents | 2,309,803,626 |
| 1910 | 4 cents | 16 $\frac{2}{3}$ cents | 2,391,109,795 |
| 1911 | 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents | 16 $\frac{2}{3}$ cents | 2,515,594,636 |
| 1912 | 10 cents | 16 $\frac{2}{3}$ cents | 2,532,710,950 |
| 1913 | 28 cents | 17 cents | 2,632,000,000 |
| 1914 | 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents | 20 cents | 2,743,000,000 |

ANNUAL ENROLLMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AND THE A. AND M. COLLEGE

The enrollment of the University for the years of its existence follows:

| | | | |
|--------------|-----|--------------|-------|
| 1883-84..... | 221 | 1899-00..... | 1,041 |
| 1884-85..... | 209 | 1900-01..... | 1,121 |
| 1885-86..... | 199 | 1901-02..... | 1,291 |
| 1886-87..... | 245 | 1902-03..... | 1,348 |
| 1887-88..... | 250 | 1903-04..... | 1,353 |
| 1888-89..... | 278 | 1904-05..... | 1,486 |
| 1889-90..... | 309 | 1905-06..... | 1,991 |
| 1890-91..... | 283 | 1906-07..... | 2,273 |
| 1891-92..... | 388 | 1907-08..... | 2,462 |
| 1892-93..... | 353 | 1908-09..... | 2,573 |
| 1893-94..... | 482 | 1909-10..... | 2,701 |
| 1894-95..... | 630 | 1910-11..... | 2,758 |
| 1895-96..... | 730 | 1911-12..... | 2,832 |
| 1896-97..... | 751 | 1912-13..... | 3,334 |
| 1897-98..... | 800 | 1913-14..... | 3,501 |
| 1898-99..... | 986 | 1914-15..... | 3,898 |

The following is the enrollment at the A. and M. College for the years of its existence:

| | | | |
|---------------|-----|---------------|-------|
| 1876-77 | 106 | 1896-97 | 311 |
| 1877-78 | 331 | 1897-98 | 337 |
| 1878-79 | 248 | 1898-99 | 356 |
| 1879-80 | 144 | 1899-00 | 396 |
| 1880-81 | 127 | 1900-01 | 382 |
| 1881-82 | 258 | 1901-02 | 407 |
| 1882-83 | 228 | 1902-03 | 396 |
| 1883-84 | 108 | 1903-04 | 378 |
| 1884-85 | 112 | 1904-05 | 414 |
| 1885-86 | 170 | 1905-06 | 416 |
| 1886-87 | 176 | 1906-07 | 515 |
| 1887-88 | 214 | 1907-08 | 625 |
| 1888-89 | 207 | 1908-09 | 644 |
| 1889-90 | 279 | 1909-10 | 838 |
| 1890-91 | 318 | 1910-11 | 1,057 |
| 1891-92 | 331 | 1911-12 | 1,126 |
| 1892-93 | 293 | 1912-13 | 1,129 |
| 1893-94 | 313 | 1913-14 | 1,040 |
| 1894-95 | 372 | 1914-15 | 1,218 |
| 1895-96 | 354 | | |

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Statement of Income from Permanent Fund and Appropriations
made by the Legislature from 1885-6 to 1915, inclusive.

| Year | Land Leases | Int. on Land Sale Loans | Int. on Bonds | Appropriations |
|--------------|-------------------|----------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| 1885-86----- | \$ 1,772.80 | \$ 11,000.00 | \$ 31,445.38 | ----- |
| 1886-87----- | 3,524.96 | 9,238.20 | 31,941.38 | ----- |
| 1887-88----- | 3,686.28 | 4,633.11 | 33,267.00 | ----- |
| 1888-89----- | 4,691.05 | 3,432.73 | 33,267.00 | ----- |
| 1889-90----- | 4,767.10 | 10,865.88 | 33,267.00 | \$ 25,000.00 |
| 1890-91----- | 15,871.80 | 4,114.07 | 33,768.00 | 25,000.00 |
| 1891-92----- | 16,063.95 | 3,216.04 | 34,318.60 | 62,000.00 |
| 1892-93----- | 8,089.20 | 2,624.06 | 31,728.60 | 32,000.00 |
| 1893-94----- | 22,792.74 | 5,255.89 | 58,606.10 | 57,200.00 |
| 1894-95----- | 11,692.80 | 3,037.10 | 31,728.60 | 38,700.00 |
| 1895-96----- | 12,944.66 | 2,938.09 | 31,728.60 | 63,500.00 |
| 1896-97----- | 40,295.18 | 3,032.28 | 31,828.60 | 61,000.00 |
| 1897-98----- | 43,895.36 | 2,014.95 | 31,878.60 | 71,000.00 |
| 1898-99----- | 54,670.74 | 2,547.02 | 31,928.50 | 68,000.00 |
| 1899-00----- | 39,814.65 | 2,621.34 | 31,895.00 | 75,000.00 |
| 1900-01----- | 57,161.62 | 2,363.87 | 31,895.00 | 75,000.00 |
| 1900-01----- | Six months' appro | priation—change in | fiscal year----- | 105,000.00 |
| 1901-02----- | 49,664.72 | 2,393.27 | 31,895.00 | 165,000.00 |
| 1902-03----- | 79,204.44 | 2,611.80 | 31,895.00 | 90,000.00 |
| 1903-04----- | 71,531.09 | 2,929.11 | 31,665.00 | 173,006.66 |
| 1904-05----- | 77,338.90 | 2,763.68 | 30,905.00 | 173,006.66 |
| 1905-06----- | 100,140.38 | 2,955.18 | 30,985.00 | 130,250.00 |
| 1906-07----- | 106,357.83 | 2,656.98 | 25,873.25 | 110,250.00 |
| 1907-08----- | 102,919.46 | 2,432.73 | 26,047.55 | 155,500.00 |
| 1908-09----- | 111,924.53 | 2,201.51 | 26,165.00 | 155,000.00 |
| 1909-10----- | 100,941.23 | 2,250.00 | 28,148.33 | 295,000.00 |
| 1910-11----- | 121,628.29 | 2,163.06 | 20,517.50 | 295,000.00 |
| 1911-12----- | 131,000.00 | 1,185.16 | 21,586.00 | 268,455.00 |
| 1912-13----- | 140,000.00 | 2,000.00 | 21,586.00 | 400,000.00 |
| 1913-14----- | 157,694.39 | 1,852.43 | 21,586.00 | 658,300.00 |
| 1914-15----- | ----- | Emergency appropriation | ----- | 352,745.89 |
| 1915-16----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | 711,682.16 |
| 1916-17----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | 711,682.16 |

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE HIGHER SCHOOLS FROM
1903 TO 1915.

Agricultural and Mechanical College.

| | | | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| 1903-04..... | \$139,000.00 | 1909-10..... | 112,750.00 |
| 1904-05..... | 71,000.00 | 1910-11..... | 96,750.00 |
| 1905-06..... | 94,485.00 | 1911-12..... | 368,350.00 |
| 1906-07..... | 88,085.00 | 1912-13..... | 196,100.00 |
| 1907-08..... | 177,285.00 | 1913-14..... | 207,300.00 |
| 1908-09..... | 150,085.00 | 1914-15..... | 317,200.00 |

College of Industrial Arts.

| | | | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| 1903-04..... | \$ 53,483.00 | 1909-10..... | 48,075.00 |
| 1904-05..... | 29,350.00 | 1910-11..... | 39,575.00 |
| 1905-06..... | 39,550.00 | 1911-12..... | 121,300.00 |
| 1906-07..... | 29,500.00 | 1912-13..... | 47,550.00 |
| 1907-08..... | 100,775.00 | 1913-14..... | 92,982.00 |
| 1908-09..... | 33,775.00 | 1914-15..... | 85,450.00 |

Sam Houston Normal School.

| | | | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|
| 1903-04..... | \$ 40,100.00 | 1909-10..... | 58,000.00 |
| 1904-05..... | 39,500.00 | 1910-11..... | 53,000.00 |
| 1905-06..... | 39,500.00 | 1911-12..... | 51,000.00 |
| 1906-07..... | 39,500.00 | 1912-13..... | 72,000.00 |
| 1907-08..... | 42,500.00 | 1913-14..... | 71,550.00 |
| 1908-09..... | 42,500.00 | 1914-15..... | 71,700.00 |

North Texas State Normal.

| | | | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| 1903-04..... | \$ 80,250.00 | 1909-10..... | 75,000.00 |
| 1904-05..... | 40,250.00 | 1910-11..... | 33,000.00 |
| 1905-06..... | 50,250.00 | 1911-12..... | 92,000.00 |
| 1906-07..... | 40,250.00 | 1912-13..... | 42,000.00 |
| 1907-08..... | 42,250.00 | 1913-14..... | 121,800.00 |
| 1908-09..... | 42,250.00 | 1914-15..... | 65,700.00 |

Southwest Texas Normal School.

| | | | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|
| 1903-04..... | \$ 37,831.00 | 1909-10..... | 49,500.00 |
| 1904-05..... | 21,300.00 | 1910-11..... | 33,000.00 |
| 1905-06..... | 50,500.00 | 1911-12..... | 68,600.00 |
| 1906-07..... | 39,500.00 | 1912-13..... | 41,000.00 |
| 1907-08..... | 51,500.00 | 1913-14..... | 74,800.00 |
| 1908-09..... | 42,500.00 | 1914-15..... | 61,000.00 |

West Texas Normal School.

| | | | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|
| 1911-12..... | \$ 59,945.00 | 1913-14..... | 62,100.00 |
| 1912-13..... | 43,150.00 | 1914-15..... | 50,600.00 |

Prairie View Normal School.

| | | | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|
| 1903-04..... | \$ 32,500.00 | 1909-10..... | 22,975.00 |
| 1904-05..... | 27,500.00 | 1910-11..... | 16,100.00 |
| 1905-06..... | 28,300.00 | 1911-12..... | 48,600.00 |
| 1906-07..... | 25,300.00 | 1912-13..... | 26,100.00 |
| 1907-08..... | 48,850.00 | 1913-14..... | 44,250.00 |
| 1908-09..... | 23,350.00 | 1914-15..... | 44,000.00 |

Extract from letter of ex-Governor O. B. Colquitt to *Dallas News*, —, 1914.

DEFICIENCIES

“In addition to the appropriations above quoted for the Colquitt administration of four years, deficiencies were granted for the Agricultural and Mechanical College, the College of Industrial Arts for Women and the normal schools as follows:

| | |
|-------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Agricultural and Mechanical College..... | \$ 87,265.00 |
| To rebuild main building..... | 200,000.00 |
| To rebuild mess hall..... | 100,000.00 |
| Deficiency to complete mess hall..... | 12,539.00 |
| Deficiency to complete main building..... | 22,500.00 |
| Prairie View Normal..... | 40,502.99 |
| Sam Houston Normal..... | 12,000.00 |
| San Marcos Normal..... | 7,500.00 |
| College of Industrial Arts..... | 7,071.00 |
| Total | \$ 489,457.99 |
| Total of general appropriation..... | \$4,166,482.19 |
| Total of deficiencies..... | 489,457.99 |
| Grand total..... | \$4,655,940.18 |

“This shows a grand total of expenditures out of the general revenue for the support, maintenance and erection of buildings for the educational institutions above mentioned for the four years of the Colquitt administration of \$4,655,940.18, which is \$558,797.86 in excess of the total amount expended for the eight years of the Lanham and Campbell administrations. This shows an increase of expenditure by my administration over the preceding administrations for these institutions of more than 100 per cent.

URGED 10 CENT TAX

“In my message to the Legislature on education, wherein I urge revision of the educational article of the constitution so as to permit of a broader system of public instruction and a more efficient and certain method of supplying revenues for the University, Agricultural and Mechanical College, the normal schools and the College of Industrial Arts, it was proposed that a tax rate not to exceed 10 cents on the one hundred dollars of valuation might be levied by the Legislature for the maintenance and support of these educational institutions of the State. The friends of the University, Agricultural and Mechanical College, the normal schools and the College of Industrial Arts, agreed that this tax rate would be a liberal allowance for those institu-

tions; but, as a matter of fact, the sums appropriated, unless some of them had been vetoed, could not have been paid, after deducting the cost of assessing, collecting, etc., out of a 10 cent tax rate."

SPECIAL TAX MEASURES BEFORE THE TEXAS LEGISLATURE OF 1911

In 1911 at the regular session of the Thirty-second Legislature, two measures looking to a betterment of the status of the University of Texas and the Agricultural and Mechanical College were introduced. One was House Joint Resolution No. 13, proposing an amendment to the Constitution, providing for the levy of a special tax of 4.4 cents on the \$100 of taxable property for the support of the University and the A. and M. College. This bill, after having passed to a third reading, finally died on the Speaker's table.

Representative Donnegan, in stating his reasons for voting against the resolution, said: "I vote against submitting the higher education tax amendment to the Constitution because it limits within unreasonable limits the power of the Legislature to provide for these institutions." (House Journal, 32d. Legislature, Regular Session of 1911, p. 822.)

The other measure before the Thirty-second Legislature was a bill introduced in the regular session of 1911, "Providing for the creation and establishment of a special fund for the University of Texas and the A. and M. College by providing that a certain part of the advalorem tax rate should be levied and collected for the institutions mentioned. This was a legislative measure, not a constitutional amendment. The Attorney General at the time ruled that such a law would be constitutional, and this bill had the support of the Board of Regents of the University and the Board of Directors of the A. and M. College. As finally amended, the bill provided for a rate of 3.7 for the University and of 1.7 for the A. and M. College. It was passed by the House, but died in the Senate.

Representative Campbell gave as his reason for voting against the bill the following: "The constitutional amendment proposed in House Joint Resolution No. 13 (see above) is to be

preferred. This bill would add too much to the tax rate of the present administration."

The following newspaper editorials were written in December, 1910 and January, 1911, and were occasioned by the agitation of the two measures mentioned above:

Houston Chronicle.—"To establish a university in Texas which should rank with the best in the nation was the dream of the men who made Texas possible, and upon the men of this generation rests the obligation to bring to a realization that cherished purpose. * * * The appropriations made for the educational institutions of Texas, compared with those of other states, have always been insignificant, and, in fact, contemptible. This is plain talk, but it is the unvarnished truth."—(Recent Editorial, *Houston Chronicle*.)

Houston Post.—"Of course, the question of imminent concern is more money. That means increased taxation, for there is no other way to get the money. As the people are willing to supply the money, then let it be done by special taxation so that the college revenues may not be only abundant, but stable and dependable. * * * The cause of educational progress demands more liberal support of the State Colleges. We ought not to be satisfied with a University that is second to that of any institution in the country."

Brownwood Bulletin.—"The *Bulletin* has no sympathy for the sentiment, or the lack of sentiment, that would allow our State institutions to suffer for the lack of funds on which to operate on the broad basis that should characterize everything done in Texas. * * * It is certainly wrong to require the regents of a school to appear in Austin at every session of the Legislature in the capacity of lobbyists that the school may get a sufficient 'appropriation' on which to exist. * * * With a direct tax the schools would be largely removed from politics and from the uncertainty always attending a school that exists on appropriations."

Austin Statesman.—"The unanimity with which the press of the State has endorsed the proposition of a special tax for the support of higher education in Texas is another healthy reminder of the civic awakening that has taken place in this State. * * * No institution in the State can be made of

greater service to the cause of development than the University of Texas."

Dallas News.—"A special tax would afford the University an income whose amount it could calculate pretty accurately, and thus enable the Regents to plan its development in a way that is impossible so long as they are left dependent upon the generosity of succeeding Legislatures. Furthermore, its income would increase with the growth of the State and as its own duties and services must increase with the growth of the State, a correspondence between needs and means would be maintained automatically and with certainty. Although the University needs more than it has been accustomed to getting, this change in the method of supporting need not necessarily entail an additional demand upon the people of the State, since the general revenue fund would be relieved of the demands which the University makes upon it."

President S. P. Brooks of Baylor University made the following statement in regard to the proposed statutory tax bill introduced in the 1911 Legislature:

"The good citizenship of the State should rise and demand a tax large enough to support the University in due form and vigorous growth. It is believed that wise legislators will heed the call—not wise to hold an ear to the ground, but wise in prophetic thinking and planning for the good of the people whom they have sworn to serve. * * * The tax will give assurance for the future. Executives can wisely plan for growth. Things will grow regularly and not by spasms. The cost to the people will not be enough to feel it; and if it were enough it would be all the better. We have little sympathy or interest in that which costs us little or nothing."

Ex-Governor Joseph D. Sayers:

"In my message to the Legislature in January, 1903, I expressed myself in favor of a levy of a special tax for the support and maintenance of the State University. I have not examined into the constitutionality of the bill now pending (1911), ——— but assuming that it is within the power of the Legislature to enact such a measure, I do not hesitate to express myself most heartily in its favor."

The University of Texas issued a bulletin urging the adop-

tion of the special tax proposed in the Legislature of 1911. The following excerpts, and also the foregoing editorials, have been taken from this bulletin.

STATEMENTS OF FAMOUS EDUCATORS.

President Brown Ayres, State University of Tennessee.—“I regard the support of the State University by means of a special tax as the ideal method of providing for such institutions. A great university is the result of a steadily pursued policy for a number of years, and such a policy is impossible unless the support of the university is positively assured.”

Chancellor S. Avery, State University of Nebraska.—“Nebraska assesses its property at one-fifth of the supposed actual valuation. We have a mill-tax for the support of the University which brings us in about \$400,000 a year. If this sum were sufficient for both maintenance and building we should have practically no legislative worries. * * * A definite tax to a State university is somewhat comparable with an endowment for a private institution. Depending on legislative appropriations out of a general state fund is like maintaining a private school on private donations.”

President Edmund J. James, University of Illinois.—“It seems to me that every thoughtful man who will give time to the consideration of the question must agree that if a state decides finally upon the establishment of a higher institution of learning such as the University, it ought to provide in some permanent way for its support and not make it dependent on the more or less accidental temper or feelings of successive legislatures.”

President James B. Angell, University of Michigan.—“The support of the University by the mill-tax is unquestionably much the best method for the University and the State. * * * If a great university is to prosper, it must be enabled to follow some permanent policy or plan, and therefore to know that it has some permanent support.”

President Benjamin Ide Wheeler, University of California.—“I am very glad to know that Texas is considering the provision of a special tax for the support of the University. That is really the only way in which a university can be properly supported. You must know well in advance what you have to expect in order

that a university should be maintained in that continuity and dignity which its name implies. Furthermore, I think it is fair that a university should share in the growth and prosperity of the State."

President A. R. Hill, University of Missouri.—"Such a tax is the most democratic method of support for a public institution. It puts its income upon a calculable and permanent basis, and provides for growth of the institution in proportion to the growth of the State. It is the most economical and satisfactory and guarded method of support that can well be imagined. All the State universities in America that are recognized as really great are supported in this way, with the exception of Illinois, which is of recent development."

President Emeritus, Charles W. Eliot, Harvard University.—"I am glad to hear that the Regents of the University of Texas propose to ask the Legislature to provide a special tax for the support of the University, in place of appropriations which have to be proposed and discussed at every recurrent assembling of the Legislature. Such a special tax would naturally be fixed at some specific fraction of the income of the State, or at so many mills on a dollar of the valuation of the property in the State; and would therefore work automatically without need of recurrence to the Legislatures, and would therefore rise with the increasing income or total valuation of the State. * * * In a progressive State like Texas, which still possesses great areas of unoccupied land and many natural resources undeveloped, the Legislature can do nothing of greater advantage to the State than to give its University a secure, continuous, rising, and practical income."

ARE OUR SCHOOLS ADEQUATELY SUPPORTED?

(Extract from pamphlet issued by the Högg Organization on "The State Institutions of Higher Education in Texas.")

An examination of the following table, giving information with respect to State Normal Schools in the United States, will indicate that Texas falls far short of the average state in the provision for these schools:

| | United States. | Texas. |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| Total No. of State Normal schools..... | 196 | 4 |
| Total No. of students, regular session..... | 79,546 | 2,250 |
| Total No. of instructors..... | 4,814 | 88 |
| Average No. of pupils per instructor..... | 16.6 | 25.6 |
| Average annual cost of maintenance per school to the State..... | \$71,840 | \$44,625 |
| Average value of laboratories for each school.. | \$23,950 | \$8,750 |
| Average value of buildings for each school.... | \$183,300 | \$125,000 |

The State of Texas expends less per capita on the enrollment in her normal schools for the training of teachers than the average state of the Union, while it falls far below that of the average progressive western state. Some of the states provide a part of the living expenses of the students. The teachers who attend the summer sessions of the four normal schools in Texas spend as much money for board, tuition, and other expenses as the State spends on these schools for the entire year.

An examination of the above table further proves that the average state normal school is investing more money in the construction of buildings than the average state normal school in Texas, all of which means that their buildings are larger, more modern in architecture and better equipped. The administration buildings in a very few of the normal schools of other states cost less than \$100,000 each, while the science buildings, library and other buildings cost from \$25,000 to \$100,000 each. It should be the settled policy of our State to give larger appropriations for the construction of modern, convenient and sanitary buildings that are planned by competent architects to meet the needs of these schools for a long period of time, and not merely to meet the immediate demands.

An examination of the official reports of State Superintendents and of the United States Commissioner of Education indicates clearly that the standards of the Texas normal schools fall below the standards that prevail in the leading normal schools of the country. Recently, the State Normal School Board of Regents increased both the entrance and graduation requirements for the Texas normal schools. If we are to keep up with the progress of other states, as above indicated, the standards must be raised further. To meet these requirements, additional revenues will be necessary.

WHY NOT ISSUE BONDS INSTEAD OF A CONSTITUTIONAL TAX?

Extract from pamphlet by A. Caswell Ellis, on the Relation
of Higher Education to the Economic
Development of the State.

There is not a university in the South that does not need at once from \$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000 for lands, buildings and equipment. As this equipment for education is absolutely essential to the economic development of the State, and as it is impossible to secure these large sums suddenly out of general taxation, I see but one solution to our problem of higher education. We must issue bonds for higher education. This is no new and untried scheme. We issue bonds to build railroads and bridges, to put in waterworks and lighting systems and to develop our mineral resources. Why should the State not issue bonds to develop its greatest and most productive resource, its human resource? The educated human mind is the greatest producing agency in the world, without which climate, fertile soil and mineral deposits are but so much useless material. We already issue bonds for elementary education. It is, therefore, all the more demanded that we issue bonds to develop our higher education in order to train leaders to direct and teachers to teach the elementary schools, so that the enormous sums spent on elementary schools shall not be longer wasted on unwise plans and un-economical methods.

EXTRACT FROM FAREWELL ADDRESS OF FORMER PRESIDENT MEZES
TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS, ON "THE FUTURE OF
THE UNIVERSITY," DEC. 16, 1914.

If the University is to serve Texas as it should, its income must be greatly increased—in fact, more than doubled. A modern state university cannot operate efficiently on less than two millions a year; and, in a huge state like Texas, it should, in the near future, be provided with three millions annually. Three universities in states much smaller are expending nearly the latter sum today, to the great benefit of their constituencies.

In addition, the following measures of legislation would, I believe, be very helpful to the University in the performance of its duties of service, and correspondingly helpful to the State as a whole: (1) a statutory measure levying a special tax for the

support of the institution; (2) an amendment repealing the portion of Section 14 of Article VII, of the Constitution prohibiting appropriations of tax levies for the erection of University buildings; and (3) a statutory measure, if the Constitution permits that method, authorizing the issuance of bonds, with interest and sinking fund payable out of the available University fund, for the construction of buildings and the purchase of additional grounds to enlarge the campus.

The special tax has been so often and fully discussed that little need be said here. It costs no more to support the University out of the proceeds of a special tax than out of biennial appropriations. The chief advantages of the tax are two: (1) the Regents will know what they can depend upon in the matter of support, and can lay their plans accordingly in a far-sighted and business-like way; (2) the University will be withdrawn further from the disturbing and perilous contact with politics into which the method of biennial appropriations unavoidably draws it.

NEED FOR A SPECIAL TAX

(Excerpt from Fifteenth Biennial Report of the Board of Regents, University of Texas.)

Biennial Appropriations Unsafe.—It is generally agreed that the plan of relying on appropriations from the general revenue, made biennially, is open to grave objections. A university, of all institutions, should be managed reasonably and prudently, on the basis of plans deliberately decided upon, providing for an orderly development stretching over a series of years. Such conduct of affairs is impossible under the system of biennial appropriations. What will be done by Legislatures and Governors two, four and six years in the future cannot possibly be foreseen. This situation compels the Regents to pursue a "hand to mouth" policy, inconsistent with the interests of the University, and destructive either of prudent or economical management.

The University Out of Politics.—The entanglement of the University in factional politics constitutes, if possible, a graver objection to the system of biennial appropriations for its maintenance. The officers of the University should not be called upon

to lobby, however important the end to be attained or unexceptionable the methods employed. Men engaged in educational service should be free to devote their best energies to their high functions. Above all, the University itself should be so supported as to be wholly independent of partisan caprice.

A Statutory Tax.—The plan of supporting the University from the proceeds of a special statutory tax has been adopted by practically all the strongest State universities of the country, and we recommend that the present Legislature employ this method of providing for the support of the University of Texas.

Rate of University Tax.—In determining the rate of such a special tax, two factors are to be borne in mind, the assessed valuation, and the reduction for cost of collection and unpaid taxes. For the current fiscal year the State's assessed valuation amounts to \$2,532,710.50. The estimates of the Comptroller, based upon the experience of many years, is that only 80 per cent of any tax levy reaches the State Treasury. Bearing these two facts in mind, the rate that will produce the average of the amounts recommended for the two years is 3.4 cents on the \$100 of assessed values. The gross yield of the tax would be \$861,121.41. Deducting 20 per cent for cost of collection and unpaid taxes, the net yield would be \$688,897.13. The assessed values could not be expected to increase sufficiently to provide the sum recommended for the second year; the values are lower this year than last. But the Regents would have the advantage of knowing what to expect for that and subsequent years.

University Tax in Other States.—The following table, taken by permission, from a bulletin of the Hogg Organization, will show that the rate mentioned is low in comparison with that of other State universities, below which the University should not stand:

| Institution. | Rate. | Additional Appropriations by Legislatures. |
|--------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------|
| California | 3 | \$ 301,786.00 |
| Colorado | 8 | 127,869.00 |
| Illinois | 10 | |
| Michigan | 4.75 | 74,000.00 |
| Minnesota | 2.30 | 1,060,377.00 |
| Nebraska | 10 | 110,000.00 |
| North Dakota | 5.33+ | 222,817.00 |
| Wisconsin | 2.85+ | 444,135.00 |
| Average | 5.78 | 334,426.00 |

Avoiding Mistakes of Other States.—It will be noted that the rates shown in the tables have proved too low in the States enumerated, with the exception of Illinois. All the other Universities mentioned have had to appeal biennially to the State Legislatures for supplementary appropriations, which they have received in the amounts shown in the table. Such a situation is unfortunate, and should not be allowed to exist in Texas. The removal of the State University from the scramble for appropriations is one of the main purposes of a special tax, and this purpose is in large measure defeated in the States mentioned. The mistake of these other States should not be repeated in Texas. It can be avoided by means of the moderate tax mentioned. With any rate lower than 3.3 cents, the number of students in attendance by 1915 will require an appeal to the Thirty-fourth Legislature for supplementary appropriations or for an increase in the tax rate. We believe that the rate recommended is a small price to pay for a permanent removal of the University from the domain of political contention.

Excerpt from "THE ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF A STATE'S INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION," by Arthur Lefevre.

A measure of vital importance must be framed to secure a state tax for the regular support of the State institutions of higher education and the four State normal schools. Some of the main benefits of such a measure would be lost if the law establishing the tax did not apportion the proceeds in three fixed parts to the three higher institutions, and a distinct part for the support of the four State normal schools. The latter ought to be administered as one fund by the State Normal Board of Regents, according to the varying needs of the respective normal schools.

The problem thus presented cannot be properly solved unless the four governing boards concerned accept some well deliberated plan, formulated in a carefully prepared bill, and unite in harmonious support of that bill. Or, if it be decided that an amendment to the Constitution is necessary, a corresponding joint resolution to submit the constitutional amendment should be prepared and supported.

The total amount that must be supplied from the revenues of the State in order that Texas may take a place among the states

that have undertaken to secure efficient services from their institutions of higher education, has been reliably ascertained from a study of the financial basis of such institution in all of those states. It is also shown in that study that the proceeds of a tax of eight-tenths of a mill, or 8 cents on \$100, on the assessment of 1911 for Texas, would not fall far short of the requisite sum—\$2,000,000. Such a tax, with wise administration, would enable the State of Texas to secure the present average services enjoyed in the other states.

There may be many Texans who would not be permanently satisfied by securing only average educational and scientific services from their institutions; but it would be prudent to postpone any undertaking looking toward leadership, until appropriate measures for so high an enterprise can be adopted in the light of experience with an average status.

A tax of one mill (10 cents on \$100) is the levy necessary to put and keep all the institutions referred to on a basis of average efficiency. If the people of Texas desire to enlarge and strengthen their educational institutions, so as to secure for themselves such services as are enjoyed in the states whose social and industrial interests are now profiting by those advantages, they must undoubtedly expend at least the amount here indicated.

The obligation upon the governing boards to agree to a fixed partitionment of the tax, is peremptory. There is no other way to avoid annual struggles that would be wretchedly injurious. On the other hand, no vital mistake could be made in fixing the division. Inasmuch as the total amount is the minimum sufficient to accomplish its purpose, it is certain that no division would apportion to any one of the three institutions more than it could use to the public advantage. If to any one should be allotted a portion that proved insufficient for enterprises which the Legislature desired to be continued or developed, an additional appropriation would be made for that institution. It is certain that every institution will from time to time have to present some special need to the Legislature. The tax proposed would provide for ordinary expenditures for building, but times must come when some large necessity for additional ground, or for some extraordinary building, would require recourse to the Legislature. Such is the proper theory of a tax for regular

maintenance and support. The Legislature ought to retain a regulative power, to be exercised in decisions concerning appropriations additional to the proceeds of an established tax sufficient to meet foreseeable necessities.

The reader is also reminded again that in California, Illinois, and Ohio great universities were excluded from consideration whose resources exceed the support provided for State universities. The co-operation of the people to secure for themselves the services of a comprehensive and efficient university, requires in Wisconsin $8\frac{1}{2}$ cents, in Minnesota $8\frac{3}{4}$ cents, in Michigan $6\frac{1}{2}$ cents, in Iowa 7 cents, in Colorado $7\frac{1}{4}$ cents, without allowance for cost of collection. These being the states of the whole list with which Texas would be most justly and most willingly compared, the 8 cents suggested for Texas should not startle anybody.

One of the great advantages of an established tax for educational institutions is the fact that the increase of property value keeps pace, at the same tax rate, with the increase of students and with the increasing needs of a growing population for many direct public services.

The addition of one cent for the normal schools would yield at the outset about \$250,000 for those four schools—an average of \$62,500 a year for each State normal school. Under the current appropriations by the Legislature for the two years ending August 31, 1913, each normal school receives on the average \$58,710 a year. If the standards of those schools are to be raised and their forces strengthened, it will be necessary to add more than one cent for the normal schools, to the eight cents for the three higher institutions. The addition of two cents for the normal schools would yield \$500,000, or an average of \$125,000 a year for each of those schools.

A tax of one mill (10 cents on \$100) is the levy necessary to put and keep all the institutions referred to on a basis of average efficiency. If the people of Texas desire to enlarge and strengthen their educational institutions so as to secure for themselves such services as are enjoyed in the states whose social and industrial interests are now profiting by those advantages, they must undoubtedly expend at least the amount here indicated.

A 10-cents tax for the maintenance and development of the

State's educational institutions would yield next year about \$2,000,000. The 10 cents must be apportioned somehow; for example:

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| University of Texas..... | 4½ cents..... | \$1,125,000 |
| A. & M. College, with Prairie View Inst. for negroes | 3 cents..... | 750,000 |
| Girls' College | ½ cent..... | 125,000 |
| Four State Normal Schools (\$125,000 each | 2 cents..... | 500,000 |

Any definite apportionment of the tax would be better than an apportionment dependent upon contingent factors. There is no factor, or combination of factors, upon which succeeding apportionments could be made to depend without entailing injurious consequences. Temptations to swell factors artificially would lead to wasteful or degrading measures. Nothing could be more ill advised, for instance, than an apportionment contingently dependent upon the number of students. Such a law would inevitably tend to corrupt the administration of all the institutions. The number of students is by no means the controlling factor of proper cost. Its bearing may coincide with that of other needs, but a great many services to the State and to individual citizens, besides teaching students for the regular term of enrollment, are to be taken into account. Every factor, however, has its due weight, and it will assist to impartial conclusions to compare the apportionment, here stated for purposes of illustration, with the number of students for the regular term of enrollment a year ago, excluding summer schools and correspondence students. Of the total number of students for regular term of enrollment, the University had 60 per cent, the A. and M. College 32 per cent, and the Girls' College 8 per cent. If 4½ cents were assigned to the University, 3 cents to the A. and M. College, and ½ cent to the Girls' College, the University would receive 56¼ per cent of the total 8 cents for the three higher institutions, the A. and M. College 37½ per cent, and the Girls' College 6¼ per cent.

The statistics in the following table were compiled by Arthur Lefevre, sometime Research Secretary of the Hogg Organization for the Enlargement by the State of Texas of its Institutions of Higher Education:

TABLE I

| 1910-1911 State Universities and A. & M. Colleges | State tax in cents or, \$100 | Income from State tax | Additional appropriations by Legis- lature | From United States Gov't | Income from produc- tive endow- ment | Income from private dona- tions | From student fees and all other sources | Total income for the year 1910-1911 |
|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| California ----- | 3 | \$710,773 | \$ 301,786 | \$ 75,000 | \$203,382 | \$104,898 | \$276,877 | \$1,672,716 |
| Colorado ----- | 8 | 313,920 | 127,839 | 73,638 | 14,350 | ----- | 132,677 | 662,454 |
| Illinois* ----- | ----- | ----- | 1,697,000 | 75,000 | 32,468 | ----- | 355,572 | 1,560,040 |
| Indiana ----- | 2 | 350,014 | 237,590 | 75,000 | 61,445 | 200,000 | 217,494 | 1,141,453 |
| Iowa ----- | 4 | 287,522 | 728,650 | 75,000 | 42,708 | ----- | 285,003 | 1,418,883 |
| Michigan ----- | 4 | 823,697 | 74,090 | 75,000 | 126,767 | 231,612 | 824,548 | 2,155,624 |
| Minnesota ----- | 2 3/4 | 410,285 | 1,060,377 | 73,000 | 59,157 | ----- | 203,981 | 1,806,800 |
| Nebraska ----- | 10 | 391,500 | 110,000 | 75,000 | 42,250 | ----- | 130,232 | 748,982 |
| North Dakota ----- | 5 1/3 | 127,557 | 222,817 | 75,000 | 106,506 | ----- | 33,230 | 615,110 |
| Ohio ----- | 2 35/100 | 554,517 | 476,975 | 45,000 | 68,405 | 5,986 | 212,345 | 1,863,229 |
| Wisconsin ----- | 2 6/7 | 783,765 | 444,135 | 75,000 | 36,503 | 45,463 | 404,603 | 1,789,469 |
| Average ----- | 4.1/2 | \$432,141 | \$ 443,737 | \$ 71,967 | \$ 72,176 | \$ 53,451 | \$284,233 | \$1,357,706 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------|-------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------------|
| Kansas ----- | none | none | \$ 886,022 | \$ 75,000 | \$ 38,492 | ----- | \$ 98,533 | \$1,098,047 |
| Missouri ----- | none | none | \$ 638,339 | \$ 72,187 | \$ 64,561 | ----- | \$ 78,715 | \$ 853,793 |
| Univ. of Tex. | ----- | ----- | \$ 295,442 | ----- | \$157,185 | \$100 | \$ 30,564 | \$ 483,291 |
| A. & M. Col. | ----- | ----- | 259,250 | \$ 63,750 | 8,234 | ----- | 33,595 | 364,829 |
| Woman's Col. | ----- | ----- | 40,325 | ----- | ----- | ----- | 2,350 | 42,635 |
| Texas ----- | none | none | \$ 565,017 | \$ 63,750 | \$165,419 | \$100 | \$ 66,509 | \$ 890,795 |

*In Illinois the last legislature enacted a law establishing a 10 cents tax for the State University, which for the future will more than double the annual appropriation given in the table.

TABLE II

| States | Population Census 1910 | Amount spent by State Institutions for Higher Edu- cation per inhabi- tant. | Assessed valua- tion of property in the State in 1910,—all reduced to 50 per cent of actual value. | Amount spent by State Institutions for Higher Edu- cation per \$1000 of wealth at 50 per cent of ac- tual value. | Tax rate in cents on \$100, at 50 per cent of actual value, which would provide the part of total cost paid by the State. |
|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| California ----- | 2,377,549 | \$.71 | \$2,373,897,092 | \$.70 | 4 1/2 |
| Colorado ----- | 799,024 | .83 | 622,328,666 | 1.66 | 7 1/4 |
| Illinois ----- | 5,638,591 | .28 | 3,237,972,675 | .48 | 3 1/2 |
| Indiana ----- | 2,700,876 | .42 | 1,480,110,080 | .77 | 4 |
| Iowa ----- | 2,224,771 | .64 | 1,512,710,640 | .94 | 7 |
| Michigan ----- | 2,810,173 | .77 | 1,451,012,615 | 1.48 | 6 1/2 |
| Minnesota ----- | 2,075,708 | .87 | 1,746,329,110 | 1.03 | 8 3/4 |
| Nebraska ----- | 1,192,214 | .63 | 1,028,675,187 | .72 | 5 |
| North Dakota ----- | 577,056 | 1.06 | 696,485,482 | .86 | 5 1/4 |
| Ohio ----- | 4,767,121 | .29 | 1,960,567,353 | .69 | 5 1/4 |
| Wisconsin ----- | 2,333,860 | .77 | 1,470,706,421 | 1.22 | 8 1/2 |
| Average ----- | 2,499,722 | \$.66 | \$1,599,163,211 | \$.90 | 6 |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|--------|-----------------|--------|-------|
| Kansas ----- | \$1,690,940 | \$.65 | \$1,528,943,030 | \$.71 | 6 |
| Missouri ----- | 3,293,335 | \$.26 | \$2,255,372,739 | \$.38 | 3 |
| Texas ----- | 3,896,542 | \$.22 | \$2,391,109,795 | \$.37 | 2 3/4 |

Texas Compared With the Average of the Foregoing List of Thirteen Selected States.

| ITEM. | The Average. | Texas. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Population, 1910. | 2,500,000 | 3,897,000 |
| Income for Higher Education, 1911 | \$1,110,000 | \$541,000 |
| Income for Higher Education per inhabitant | 44 cents | 15 cents |
| Income for Higher Education per \$1,00 actual wealth | 23 cents | 16 cents |
| Income for Higher Education per student in Regular Session.... | \$296.00 | \$167.00 |
| Income for Higher Education from State Taxes | \$858,000 | \$595,000 |
| Income for Higher Education from State Taxes per inhabitant.... | 34 cents | 15 cents |
| Income for Higher Education from Endowment, Fees, etc. | \$441,000 | \$296,000 |
| Number of Teachers per hundred students | 9.3 | 6.1 |
| Values of Higher Educational plants | \$4,430,000 | \$3,213,000 |

FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF
MINNESOTA.

(Statement by the Chief Accountant, July 1, 1915.)

From the organization of the University of Minnesota in 1869-70 down to the year 1895, the policy pursued by the Legislature was, to make direct appropriations for the support of the University. The first annual appropriation was made in 1874 and amounted to \$19,000. Later this was increased to \$23,000; then to \$35,000 and again to \$40,000 and finally to \$65,000. This last amount was appropriated for the years 1890 to 1895.

There was a good deal of opposition to these appropriations and they were secured with more or less difficulty. The State was sparsely settled, the people were poor and they felt it their duty to cut out every dollar of unnecessary expense.

About 1890 the State entered upon a period of almost unexampled prosperity. The Regents felt that the time was opportune for a change of policy. After a thorough examination of the whole subject, they believed that there would be less opposition to a mill-tax and that a larger amount would be secured than by the old plan of direct appropriations, and as the State was growing rapidly in population as well as in wealth, that the income would steadily increase year by year without the necessity of going before the Legislature and ask for increase of appropriations and be compelled to thresh out the whole question as they had been doing for the past twenty-five years.

There was much less opposition to this policy by the Legislature than there had been from previous Legislatures when the amount to be secured was very much less. The first mill-tax of 15-100 of one-mill was secured by the Legislature of 1895. This continued for three years, when the tax was increased to 23-100 of a mill. This latter tax has now been in operation for sixteen years, and the income derived from the tax has increased from \$88,904.78 to \$324,806.03. There has been no opposition to the mill-tax and it seems to give entire satisfaction.

The income from the mill-tax is supplemented by special appropriations from the Legislature at every session.

Extracts from "A TENTATIVE REPORT TO THE VIRGINIA EDUCATION COMMISSION ON A MILL TAX FOR THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF THE STATE." By Charles G. Maphis, Secretary, Charlottesville, Va., October 7, 1910. (Bulletin of the Virginia Department of Education, 1912.)

There are four methods of support now being used:

- (1) Biennial appropriations.
- (2) Annual appropriations for a term of years.
- (3) An appropriation of a fixed percentage of the total gross revenues of the State.

The latter method is used in but one State—Tennessee.

It is my belief that an appropriation based on property, commonly called a mill tax, is the best of these methods.

Sixteen States have adopted this method of support for one or more of their educational institutions, and twenty-one out of eighty-three State universities and other institutions of higher education are supported in whole or in part by a mill tax.

Summarized and briefly stated, the arguments for the mill tax method of support are as follows:

1. Experience proves that the millage method is the best one. Sixteen of the most progressive states, supporting twenty-one of the most prosperous institutions, have adopted it, and after having an experience with it, pronounce it the best.

2. It enables the institutions or system thus supported to have a fixed policy which shall be in force for an indefinite period, and to make far-seeing and wiser plans for future growth and needs. No consistent educational policy can be carried out without some degree of dependence upon a certain income. The administrative officers must have some reasonable anticipation of the funds which can be commanded for use, if they are to plan wisely and economically.

Private institutions have an endowment and hence an assured income, which, while not often sufficient, is always certain. The mill tax amounts to a permanent endowment with the State behind it.

3. It produces a constantly increasing revenue, while private endowments, desirable and helpful as they are, produce decreasing returns on account of lower rates of interest.

The revenue from a mill tax is certain to grow somewhat from

year to year and to grow very considerably when long periods of time are taken into consideration. In Minnesota, for instance, it has doubled in the last ten years.

Experience in other states has shown that the amount of revenue will increase with the increase in the wealth of the State and in proportion to the growth and needs of the school system. It does not always keep up with them, but nearly every State which has had a mill tax for any length of time has not only continued it, but has increased it, one or more times as the needs have demanded. A fixed appropriation continually becomes inadequate, and it is difficult to get it increased.

4. It gives stability to the business efforts of a school system, which could not be expected at all if it depended on an annual or biennial presentation of the needs of the Legislature.

5. It provides a stable support in times of financial depression and eras of politicalism, such as we had in 1879, when the total school revenue fell from \$1,000,000 to \$512,000, and is, therefore, a scientific and practical method of support.

6. It prevents constant and undignified lobbying throughout the session of the Legislature, and avoids the unseemly biennial scrambles and unpleasant rivalry among the several State institutions before the legislative committee.

7. It saves much time and annoyance to the legislators themselves by relieving them of the importunities of a most persistent and numerous class of lobbyists, and prevents "log-rolling" and "wire-pulling" among representatives of different parts of the State when one institution is, as it usually is, played against another located in a different part of the State. These rivalries often lead to unnecessary duplication of work intended only to appeal for an appropriation.

8. It adds to the dignity and self-respect of the school men themselves by relieving them of the necessity of engaging in this unwilling, unpleasant, but necessary struggle for existence, which is an unwise use of the time, energy and ability of the president, trustees and friends of an institution, and puts a premium on political leadership rather than educational leadership. The general progress in this country is toward academic freedom and the elimination of politics from education.

Dr. Webster Merrifield, for twenty-five years president of the

University of North Dakota, writes as follows: "I was chiefly responsible for the passage of the mill tax in North Dakota for the support of the University and other State schools, and was at the head of the University of North Dakota during ten years of operation under the tax. My opinion as to the superiority of the mill tax is (1) Certainty; (2) Avoidance of unseemly scrambles between the several State schools before the appropriation committees of the Legislature; (3) Increase of income from year to year fairly proportional to the growth of the State in wealth and the growth of the University in numbers and needs. Before the passage of the mill tax we never knew beforehand whether or not the University was going to receive a fairly adequate appropriation for maintenance. There was a recurrence each biennial period of unpleasant rivalry between the different State schools. There was need of almost constant and always undignified lobbying throughout the session of the Legislature. I am confident, too, that the University has habitually received a larger annual income from the tax for maintenance than it could have hoped to receive during the same time from direct biennial appropriations. Few members of the Legislature of 1899 which passed the mill tax realized or ventured to say how large an income it would bring to the several State schools. Almost every year the Legislature is raided by special institutions for appropriations. They maintain skilled lobbies, and but for the presence on the statute books of the permanent mill tax, would often divert to themselves a portion of the State's total income which now goes to the schools. After ten years of operation under the fixed appropriations for State schools, neither the schools nor the members of the Legislature would be willing to go back to the old system. The legislators themselves are spared almost endless 'pulling and hauling' by individuals whom some of them are fond of alluding to as 'those educational sharks,' and are measurably relieved of the importunities of a most persistent, if not the most numerous and unscrupulous class of lobbyists. For the school men, too, the gain is enormous. I was conscious of an immediate and tremendous gain in self-respect after being relieved of the necessity of engaging in a biennial scramble for existence, institutionally speaking. And if now the fixed tax for maintenance could be supplemented by

another for building purposes, I should feel that the life of a State university president is as nearly ideal as is often realized on this earth."

President Charles VanHise, of the University of Wisconsin, writes in reference to the mill tax: "The fundamental argument which we used in its advocacy was that in a rapidly growing State a fixed appropriation continually becomes inadequate because the University grows in proportion to the growth of the State. I showed that this theory was in accordance with the facts, that the growth of the University has been more rapid than the increase in income, and that in consequence, it was becoming increasingly difficult to keep our work up to a high school standard. These ideas were finally accepted by the Legislature and we were granted two-sevenths of a mill tax, which, when it went into effect, raised our income approximately \$200,000 per annum. Since that time the increase in assessed valuation of the property of the State has increased our income annually not less than \$33,000, and the increase in 1908 is \$63,000."

A mill tax is seemingly so slight that it does not raise the violent opposition to be found in an attempt to pass direct appropriations, and again the proceeds of the mill tax continue to increase as the property of the State increases. The mill tax in the State of Minnesota has doubled in the last ten years—\$135,000 in 1900, \$265,000 in 1910.

Dr. J. K. Patterson, president of the State Collegé of Kentucky, whose institution has been supported by a mill tax of one-twentieth of a mill for the past twenty-seven years, writes that he prefers this method of support because it is less subject to the caprice of the Legislature. He states that the mill tax is not likely to be repealed in Kentucky.

Dr. Charles A. Lowry, president of the State Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Colorado, writes that the mill tax for his institution and that of the other State institutions is for support, and buildings, if the money is not all needed for support. The advantage of the mill tax lies in the fact that the authorities always have a definite basis to figure on. The Legislature is more or less a changeable body, and unless a definite amount is provided, the authorities and the State institutions never

know what to count on. Very often hardly enough is appropriated for maintenance. Again, a great deal is appropriated so that work can be started which must later be given up, when an economical Legislature comes into power.

Mr. E. W. Stanton, secretary of Iowa State College, writes that his institution received the proceeds of a tax of one-fifth of a mill for building purposes which yielded in 1909-10 \$135,000. The tax runs for five years, but has been renewed twice, and he hopes to have it extended for another five-year period in 1912. Since the first tax came into effect in 1900, the total income by the close of 1912 will be something more than \$1,400,000. The buildings on the college grounds are inventoried at something over \$1,600,000 of this value. Prior to 1900 the department buildings were temporary structures utterly inadequate to meet the growing needs of the institution. The millage tax lifted the college out of these temporary buildings into fire-proof, durable structures that last for generations. This result could not have been accomplished by direct appropriations from the general revenues of the State. The millage tax enables trustees and faculty to plan wisely in the matter of buildings, and has helped in no small measure to the symmetrical development of the institutions, the fund for their support must be taken out of the general revenues, and this is always insufficient. Under the tax method the income gradually increases with the increase of the wealth of the State.

Excerpts from the "REPORT OF H. S. PRITCHETT, CHAIRMAN OF
THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF
TEACHING. 1908."

The most impressive feature of the advance of the tax-supported institutions is the generous support accorded to them by their respective states. Several states now contribute annually a million dollars each to the support of their respective state universities, and in some states the bulk of this income comes in the form of a mill tax which is rendered without action of the Legislature and which increases automatically with each revaluation of State property. A million dollars a year is, however, a very modest sum for a great and rich state like Wisconsin, or Illinois, or California to spend on its State University. These

institutions may confidently expect incomes far larger than any privately endowed universities can hope to enjoy. It is clear that State support of education in a commonwealth educated to that ideal is the most generous and constant source from which such support can be drawn. . . . There is one feature of State support of education which is worth noting. In the earlier days the State University president was expected to lobby for his annual appropriation. In the better institutions ~~that~~ day has gone by. The State University president goes before committees of the Legislature with his budget. He appears there not as a beggar but as a State officer, exactly as the head of a government bureau goes before the committees of appropriations of Congress.

Excerpts from "A COUNSEL OF PERFECTION: A PLAN FOR AN AUTOMATIC COLLECTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF A STATE TAX FOR HIGHER EDUCATION." By J. G. Rosengarten. Reprinted from the Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 52, No. 209, April, 1913.

Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Montana, Wisconsin, are among the western states which have State universities. In their State Constitutions provision is made for an automatic assignment of a small part of the State taxes for their support. Thus all appeal to the State Legislature for support is made unnecessary. In Wisconsin, and in many other universities, colleges, etc., the United States Land Grant is made part of the endowment of the State University, and for agricultural and technical schools. Iowa has recently put all its educational institutions under a single governing board. All the western universities have out of the increasing wealth and revenues of their states provided incomes growing in proportion to their needs, and their activities keep pace with them.

Dr. James B. Angell, President of the University of Michigan, gives the following reasons for preferring a mill tax:

"1. When several items are named, great difficulty for legislative committees, two to three of which in each house have to act; difficult to make some members appreciate need of some items.

"2. A university should know approximately some few years

at least in advance what it can depend on, in order to have a policy.

“3. As one legislature cannot bind its successors, it has happened to us to have one provide for establishing a department and when professors and apparatus have been secured and students have come, the next Legislature has failed to continue it and much embarrassment has followed, e. g., our school of mines.

“Whereas, our experience shows that once the mill tax is adopted, the disposition of Legislatures is to increase it, not to abolish it.

“Begin with a modest rate, and trust the future for growth.”

THE PENNSYLVANIA LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU STATE-
MENTS. INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION RECEIVING
STATE AID BY TAXATION OR APPROPRIATION.

| State. | Institution. | Mill Tax Rate. | Receipts from Mill Tax. | Appropriation for Current Expenses. |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Alabama----- | Alabama Polytechnic Institute----- | ----- | ----- | \$ 68,500 |
| | University of Alabama----- | ----- | ----- | 81,000 |
| Arizona----- | University of Arizona----- | ----- | ----- | 47,170 |
| Arkansas----- | University of Arkansas----- | ----- | ----- | 90,980 |
| California----- | University of California----- | ----- | ----- | 253,870 |
| Colorado----- | University of Colorado----- | 2/5 | \$160,000 | 30,000 |
| | Colorado State Agricultural College----- | 1/5 | 85,843 | 44,330 |
| | Colorado School of Mines----- | 1/5 | 80,210 | |
| | State Teachers College of Colorado----- | 1/5 | 80,000 | 35,000 |
| Connecticut----- | Connecticut Agricultural College----- | ----- | ----- | 31,375 |
| Delaware----- | Delaware College----- | ----- | ----- | 12,000 |
| Florida----- | University of Florida----- | ----- | ----- | 29,885 |
| | Florida State College for Women----- | ----- | ----- | 40,000 |
| Georgia----- | University of Georgia----- | ----- | ----- | \$118,025 |
| | Georgia School of Technology----- | ----- | ----- | 75,000 |
| | North Georgia Agricultural College----- | ----- | ----- | 21,500 |
| Hawaii----- | College of Hawaii----- | ----- | ----- | 10,000 |
| Idaho----- | University of Idaho----- | ----- | ----- | 52,000 |
| Illinois----- | University of Illinois----- | 1* | ----- | 1,405,650 |
| Indiana----- | Indiana University----- | 1/10 | 180,000 | 75,000 |
| | Purdue University (Ind.)----- | 1/10 | 179,504 | 121,691 |
| Iowa----- | Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts----- | 1/5 | 182,200† | 438,018 |
| | Iowa State Teachers College----- | 1/10 | 50,000† | 181,750 |
| | State University of Iowa----- | 1/5 | 175,000† | 428,825 |
| Kansas----- | University of Kansas----- | ----- | ----- | 434,883 |
| | Kansas State Agricultural College----- | ----- | ----- | 373,250 |
| Kentucky----- | State University of Kentucky----- | 1/20 | 49,923 | 165,077 |
| Louisiana----- | Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College----- | ----- | ----- | 124,500 |
| Maine----- | University of Maine----- | ----- | ----- | 115,000 |
| Maryland----- | Maryland Agricultural College----- | ----- | ----- | 36,000 |
| Massachusetts----- | Massachusetts Agricultural College----- | ----- | ----- | 212,512 |
| | Massachusetts Institute of Technology----- | ----- | ----- | 29,000 |
| Michigan----- | University of Michigan----- | 3/8 | 730,657 | 9,000 |
| | Michigan Agricultural College----- | 1/10 | 202,210 | |
| | Michigan College of Mines----- | ----- | ----- | 65,000 |
| Minnesota----- | University of Minnesota----- | 23/100 | 680,521 | 831,205 |
| Mississippi----- | Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College----- | ----- | ----- | 179,499 |
| | Mississippi Industrial Institute and College----- | ----- | ----- | 70,000 |
| | University of Mississippi----- | ----- | ----- | 32,250 |
| Missouri----- | University of Missouri----- | ----- | ----- | 513,393 |
| Montana----- | Montana College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts----- | ----- | ----- | 76,402 |
| | Montana State School of Mines----- | ----- | ----- | 33,000 |
| | University of Montana----- | ----- | ----- | 100,000 |
| Nebraska----- | University of Nebraska----- | 1 | 374,103 | 92,215 |
| Nevada----- | University of Nevada----- | 1/2 | 41,039 | 60,526 |

*First income from this source will be available July 1, 1913.

†For buildings and permanent improvements.

| State. | Institution. | Mill Tax Rate. | Receipts from Mill Tax. | Appropriation for Current Expenses. |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| New Hampshire. | New Hampshire College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. | ----- | ----- | 14,028 |
| New Jersey. | Rutgers College. | ----- | ----- | 50,476 |
| New Mexico. | University of Mexico. | 65/100 | 39,590 | 39,590 |
| | New Mexico School of Mines. | ----- | ----- | 19,000 |
| | New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. | ----- | ----- | 16,000 |
| New York. | Cornell University. | ----- | ----- | 326,152 |
| North Carolina. | University of North Carolina. | ----- | ----- | 87,000 |
| | North Carolina College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. | ----- | ----- | 83,000 |
| North Dakota. | North Dakota Agricultural College. | 1/5 | 56,221 | 25,000 |
| | University of North Dakota. | 33/100 | 92,786 | 51,455 |
| Ohio. | Ohio University. | 17/2000 | 88,490 | 48,750 |
| | Ohio State University. | 107/2000 | 397,527 | 95,754 |
| | Miami University. | 17/2000 | 83,391 | 69,788 |
| Oklahoma. | University of Oklahoma. | ----- | ----- | 150,000 |
| | Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College. | ----- | ----- | 100,000 |
| | Oklahoma State School of Mines and Metallurgy. | ----- | ----- | no report |
| Oregon. | State Agricultural College. | ----- | ----- | 179,500 |
| | University of Oregon. | ----- | ----- | 125,000 |
| Pennsylvania. | State College. | ----- | ----- | 269,260 |
| Porto Rico. | University of Porto Rico. | ----- | ----- | 83,025 |
| Rhode Island. | Rhode Island State College. | ----- | ----- | 27,000 |
| South Carolina. | South Carolina Military Academy. | ----- | ----- | 32,278 |
| | Clemson Agricultural College. | ‡ | 114,113 | 69,106 |
| | University of South Carolina. | ----- | ----- | 68,500 |
| South Dakota. | South Dakota State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. | ----- | ----- | 30,250 |
| | South Dakota State School of Mines. | ----- | ----- | 96,000 |
| | University of South Dakota. | ----- | ----- | 268,455 |
| Tennessee. | University of Tennessee. | § | 66,139 | 208,697 |
| Texas. | University of Texas. | ----- | ----- | 30,000 |
| | Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas. | ----- | ----- | 65,839 |
| Utah. | Agricultural College of Utah. | | 65,839 | 150,000 |
| | University of Utah. | ¶ | 150,000 | 26,000 |
| Vermont. | University of Vermont and State Agricultural College. | ----- | ----- | 67,683 |
| Virginia. | Virginia Polytechnic Institute. | ----- | ----- | 92,667 |
| | University of Virginia. | ----- | ----- | 40,000 |
| | Virginia Military Institute. | ----- | ----- | 40,000 |
| | College of William and Mary. | ----- | ----- | 267,000 |
| Washington. | State College of Washington. | ----- | ----- | 379,000 |
| | University of Washington. | ----- | ----- | 145,000 |
| West Virginia. | West Virginia University. | ----- | ----- | 164,000 |
| Wisconsin. | University of Wisconsin. | 3/8 | 1,103,029 | |
| Wyoming. | University of Wyoming. | 1/2 | 84,161 | |

‡Fertilizer tax.

§13% per cent. of gross revenue of the state.

¶7.94 per cent. of 4½ mills on the dollar.

||18.04 per cent. of 4½ mills on the dollar.

Excerpts from OHIO UNIVERSITY BULLETIN, ATHENS, OHIO,
JANUARY, 1913, by President Alston Ellis:

Universities supported wholly, or in part, by a definite mill tax represent the following named states: Colorado, $2/5$; Iowa, $1/5$; Indiana, $1/10$; Illinois, 1; Kentucky, $1-20$; Michigan, $3/8$; Minnesota, $23/100$; Nebraska, $1/5$; Nevada, $1/2$; North Dakota, $33/100$, Ohio, four institutions and two normal schools, $33/400$; Washington, $19/40$; Wyoming, $1/2$.

The states giving their universities support by direct legislative appropriations are Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Kansas, Maine, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Texas—12.

California has a permanent fund for the support of its university, and this fund increases automatically at the rate of 7 per cent per annum. The University of Utah receives 64.43 per cent of 28 per cent of the total revenues of the State. Tennessee gives to its university, 7 per cent of 25 per cent of its total revenue. The University of Minnesota, included in the mill tax list, receives two-thirds of its income of \$1,066,000 from direct appropriations. In Texas, there is agitation for the submission of a constitutional amendment providing for a mill tax for the support of the University of Texas, the Agricultural and Mechanical College, the College of Industrial Arts, and the four State normal schools for white teachers.

Replies to the second question showed twenty-three advocates of a definite mill tax for the support of a State's educational agencies.

Six statements received left the space below the question vacant. In no single case did anyone reporting favor the support of the State's institutions of learning by direct appropriations alone.

A few statements following the second question are herewith given for the reason that they are worthy of consideration in themselves and are fairly indicative of the general purport of all the reports received:

Wyoming—"Support of higher education by a state-wide mill tax is the best method of supplying educational needs. This method avoids the perils and uncertainties of the usual legislative process. It is not burdensome, the tax always being a

small proportion of each individual's tax bills. It produces an automatically growing income as assessments rise. Boards can plan wisely for years ahead."

Texas—The Biennial Report of the Board of Regents of the University of Texas, contains the following statements: "It is generally agreed that the plan of relying on appropriations from the general revenue, made biennially, is open to grave objections, and we do not recommend such appropriations unless the Legislature should decline to provide for the University's necessities by means of the special tax that is recommended. A university, of all institutions, should be managed reasonably and prudently, on the basis of plans deliberately chosen, and providing for an orderly development stretching over a series of years. Such a conduct of affairs is impossible under the system of biennial appropriations. What will be done by legislatures and governors two, four, and six years in the future cannot possibly be foreseen. This compels the Regents to pursue a hand-to-mouth policy, inconsistent with the interests of the University and destructive of prudent and economical management.

"The entanglements of the University in factional politics constitutes, if possible, a graver objection to the system of biennial appropriations for its maintenance. The officers of the University should not be called upon to lobby, however important the end to be obtained or unexceptional the methods employed. Men engaged in educational service should be free to devote their best energies to their high functions. Above all, the University itself should be so supported as to be wholly independent of partisan caprice."

Maine—"We believe that a mill tax would be a better way of supporting higher education for these reasons:

(1) The amount appropriated would grow as the wealth of the State increased.

(2) Continuous plans could be made that would extend through a long series of years.

(3) The satisfaction coming from a definite understanding of what income would be available would be worth a great deal."

Indiana—"We believe thoroughly in the wisdom of this method of supporting educational institutions."

Michigan—"From the point of view of the University, the value of a mill tax lies in its permanency and certainty. The Regents or Trustees of a University are undoubtedly better judges of its needs than the Legislature can be. The Regents, when they have the advantage of a definite, minimum income to figure on, are able to lay plans for the future, and to establish a definite policy, which has as great advantage for the University as any other definite, well-laid-out scheme has over a slipshod, hand-to-mouth policy."

Nebraska—"The advantage to us of our tax rate is as follows: While the proceeds must be biennially appropriated, the Legislature regards this as money collected for the benefit of the institution and appropriates it usually without a dissenting vote. It appropriates it for the benefit of the institution, and does not require that the items be specified. Thus we avoid the need of making out an itemized budget in advance."

"As the State increases in wealth, the revenues increase automatically, hence the great growth of the institution has been in part met by the revenues that have flown in through the increase of the taxable property of the State. It gives us something approaching the income of an endowment."

Oklahoma—"I. The University of Oklahoma is not supported by a mill tax. II. The State University should have a permanent mill tax devoted to its support, because:

"(1) The management of the school would then be able to provide a continuous and progressive policy, covering a considerable number of years.

"(2) The University would be relieved from sudden fluctuations in public opinion either favorable to or antagonistic to the University.

"(3) The president of the University would be relieved from the temptation to make appointments or confer other political favors in exchange for influence in passing the University appropriations through the Legislature."

South Carolina—"(1) The authorities would be better able to plan their financial policy, having a fairly definite estimate as to their income.

"(2) The institution would be kept out of politics.

“(3) The income of the institution would grow in proportion to the growth of the State.

“(4) It would emphasize the unity of the system.”

In a letter from Hon. P. P. Claxton, United States Commissioner of Education, bearing the date of November 13, 1912, are found the following statements:

“I am much interested in your statement in regard to the probability that an effort will be made to abolish the mill tax for the support of the institutions of higher learning in Ohio. Unless some better plans of supporting institutions is provided immediately, this would doubtless be a great mistake. And it would be difficult to find a better means. So far, the mill tax for the support of State schools has proven to be most satisfactory. The reasons for this are very easy to understand:

“First, it assures a steady income.

“Second, this income increases, naturally, as the population and wealth of the State increases, and in proportion to the corresponding needs for larger support of the schools.

“Third, if the income from this source should prove too small or too large, it could easily be changed by making a change in the rate.

“Fourth, it prevents the possibility of juggling with funds.

“Fifth, it obviates the unseemly destructive squabbles which sometimes arise between those interested in and responsible for the support of the lower schools and the institutions of higher learning.

“I look with misgiving, that some business sense awakens, upon the plan that has been proposed of abolishing the mill tax for the support of the schools and the State educational institutions. The carrying out of that plan means the placing of them upon an uncertain and insecure financial basis. Under such a condition of financial chaos, no intelligent effort could project itself far into the future. The proposition is suggestive of a management without stability, force or efficiency. A precarious revenue would tie the hands and hold back energies of every one working in any manner for the educational upbuilding of the State.

“Then, too, all business experience protests against the abandonment of the present system of providing for educational

maintenance. No enterprise of any moment should be entered upon before ways and means for its intelligent prosecution have been wisely considered and adequately provided. The most disagreeable feature connected with the management of the educational institutions in our State is the necessity that forces those in control of them to make application to the General Assembly for special appropriations. Added to this loss of time and energy, which under more satisfactory conditions could be better expended elsewhere, is the fear, forcing to active effort, that all-advised legislation may sweep away, in a day, the little fund made, as it were, an endowment by past legislative wisdom. The thought and activity much needed to promote work within the institution and make known its scope and value to those who might be induced thereby to avail themselves of its advantages are weakened by the necessity of lobbying efforts to hold appropriated revenue and to secure much-needed additions thereto.

“A certain mill tax revenue should need no advocacy before those who are really desirous of promoting the growth of the State’s educational institutions. The sign-board of experience points unerringly to the kind of business management these institutions should be under to put them in a favorable condition for accomplishing, with good result, the purpose for which they were established. Give them a certain revenue, as liberal in amount as all considerations and conditions make advisable; place them under the control of boards whose membership has been judiciously selected; and then free them from threats of unwise legislative interference. Under such a policy every educational institution in the State would feel the thrill of new life and a more energized purpose. Institutions’ well-being suggests a definite, reliable financial support. This will never come by annual or biennial special appropriations—always, as experience has proved, matters involved in much uncertainty—a feast to-day; a famine tomorrow.”

Arthur Lefevre, Secretary for Research, State of Texas, referring to the injurious rivalry, on the part of different educational institutions, as seen in ever recurring scrambles before legislatures for appropriations, hits the mark when he says:

“A State tax for the institutions of higher education, definitely apportioned between them by the law levying the tax,

would remove entirely the ground of the argument in question. This is the only right arrangement for applying the State's support, and it also represents the best practice. It is remarkable that this effective remedy seems not to suggest itself to advocates of concentration or of central boards."

SUMMARY OF POINTS IN FAVOR OF A MILL TAX.

Adapted from a bulletin issued by the University of Kansas in 1912, entitled, "A Plea for a Mill Tax."

1. A mill tax would benefit the State's higher educational institutions. It would ensure a more healthy growth of such institutions, because normal growth in an educational institution is possible only when plans providing for such growth can be made, extending over a number of years.

2. It would make it less easy for other universities to take some of the best teachers from Texas, as they have been doing, because of the greater permanence of these universities in the matter of income, and the greater certainty with which their teachers can depend on the continuance of their work.

3. It would make it possible to take better care of the details of the schools' administration. Under the present system, the University budget for the expenditures in June, 1917, had to be compiled in the fall of 1914,—almost three years ahead. With a permanent income, each year would be provided for as occasion required and the administration would know definitely what to count on.

4. It would save the time of administrative heads and members of the faculty who are compelled by their duty to the interests entrusted to them by the state to go to Austin and exert their efforts to have these interests understood by the Legislature, in order to prevent the doing of some serious injury to some branch of the educational or state service work through oversight or lack of knowledge.

5. It would relieve administrative heads from the humiliation of being criticised for attending committee sessions at the Legislature and doing the necessary legislative work to which their devotion and duty to their institutions obligates them.

6. It would put Texas among the states which have already given their educational institutions the advantage of permanent incomes by fixed tax: Iowa, Ohio, Wisconsin, Michigan,

Minnesota, Colorado, California, Indiana, Illinois, Nebraska, and others.

7. It would remove all temptation from educational institutions to save their interests by resorting to political methods. No State institution would ever be drawn into politics.

8. It would put the maintenance of the higher educational institutions on a permanent basis, removing them from the danger of having their revenues curtailed by caprice or financial depression, and enabling the administration to pursue a definite business-like policy.

9. It would insure the gradual and proportionate increase of the revenues for education as the value of the property in the State increases, providing automatically the larger means of meeting growing needs.

10. It would emphasize the insignificance of the cost of education to the individual taxpayer. If he pays taxes on a valuation of \$10,000 the mill tax would cost him \$10. Would any man question that the presence in the State of educational institutions, doing an immense amount of State service work, adds not one but many dollars to the value of each thousand dollars worth of property that he possesses?

11. A permanent tax would relieve the legislator from the responsibility of the present large total of appropriations, removing from his shoulders the burden of practically the entire educational budget of the State. It would also relieve him from the well-meant but sometimes over-zealous importunities of the advocates of the various institutions. It would save the time of legislators who are now compelled to study the intricacies of appropriation bills while occupied with scores of other legislative matters. To understand thoroughly the details of the University appropriation bill alone would require all the time that the ordinary legislator can devote to the duties of the legislative session.

12. It would build up more creditable institutions. By eliminating competition it would make towards a better co-operation among the various schools, and a consequent increase of efficiency and value to the State.

13. It would result in a more economic administration of

the educational institutions because system based on a stable and calculable income always means economy.

14. It would be to the advantage of the taxpayers because it would insure their getting the greatest possible efficiency out of the State schools, the greatest possible value for their money, since only with a fixed and permanent income can an educational institution do its best work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Taxation and Revenue Systems of State and Local Governments: Being a digest of constitutional and statutory provisions to Taxation in the different states, 1912. By the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D. C.

The Mill Tax as a Basis for a Permanent Income for all of the State Educational Institutions. A pamphlet by the Alumni Association, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.

A Study of the Financial Basis of the State Universities and Agricultural Colleges in Fourteen States. By Arthur Lefevre, sometime Secretary for Research of the Hogg Organization for the Enlargement by the State of Texas of Its Institutions of Higher Education, Austin, Texas.

A Counsel of Perfection: A Plan for An Automatic Collection and Distribution of a State Tax for Higher Education.

Pamphlet by J. G. Rosengarten. Reprinted from the Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 52, No. 209, April, 1913.

The Organization and Administration of a State's Institutions of Higher Education, by Arthur Lefevre. Published by the Hogg Organization, Austin, Texas.

The Future of the University of Texas: Its Duties, Opportunities, Prospects. A Final Message to the Board of Regents by former President S. E. Mezes, University, Austin.

Statistics of State Universities and Other Institutions of Higher Education Partially Supported by the State. A pamphlet by the United States Bureau of Education, Washington, D. C., 1910.

Eleventh Biennial Report of the Board of Regents of the University of Texas, 1904.

Fourteenth Biennial Report of the Board of Regents of the University of Texas, 1910.

Fifteenth Biennial Report of the Board of Regents of the University of Texas, 1912, pp. 11-15.

The Special Tax for the University of Texas. A pamphlet issued by the University, 1911.

State Support of Public Schools in Ohio. Bulletin of the Ohio University, February, 1913. Athens, Ohio. A strong affirmative argument.

Report of the Virginia Education Commission to the General Assembly, 1912. University of Virginia, Richmond, Va., pp. 64-80.

Proceedings of the Thirty-second Texas Legislature, Regular Session of 1911. State Library, Austin, Texas.

Better Financial Support for the Public Schools, by President Alston Ellis, in Ohio University Bulletin for January, 1913. Athens, Ohio.

Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Austin, Texas, 1910.

tion to deliver public lectures in Texas towns, when asked to do so. About a hundred lectures in fifteen different lines of work are now available.

Public Welfare Division.

It is the purpose of this division to collect data regarding economic conditions in the State and to furnish the same to citizens of Texas through exhibits of photographs, charts, diagrams, statistics, etc., supplemented by illustrated lectures and printed bulletins.

Division of Public School Improvement.

The Division of Public School Improvement has charge of the various educational exhibits sent out by the University to fairs and other large gatherings, for the purpose of calling the attention of the people to some of the crying needs of Texas and pointing out the most intelligent method of meeting these needs.

Correspondence Division.

The University of Texas now offers for home study correspondence courses in the following subjects of college grade: Botany, Civil Engineering, Drawing, Economics, Education, Electrical Engineering, English, French, Geology, German, Government, Greek, History, Latin, Mathematics, Mining, Engineering, Philosophy, Public Speaking, Spanish, and Zoology.

The following correspondence courses preparatory to Teachers Certificates are also offered: Algebra, Bookkeeping, Chemistry, Geometry (Plane and Solid), History of Education, History (general), Literature, Physics, Psychology, and Trigonometry.

Programs and courses of study for clubs or other associations are also offered. Correspondence is invited.

For complete list of bulletins of the Department of Extension, address the Extension Librarian, University, Austin.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 289 621 4